JS 44 (Rev 06/17)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

DEFENDANTS

PETER CATINA		; /		WEST CHESTER	UNIVERS	ITY		17	
(b) County of Residence o	of First Listed Plaintuf La	ancaster (SES))	County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	an u.s. P.	LAINTIFF CASHS OF			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Michelle R. Dempsky, Es 1628 John F. Kennedy B 215-475-3567	sq Kraemer, Manes,		/	Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	OTION Mace an "X" in On	ne Bax Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
O I U.S Government	≥ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF		and One Box fo	or Defenda PTF	DEF
Plaintiff	U.S. Government N	ioi a Party)	Citizo	en of This State J	N. C. S.	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		0.4	0.4
Cl 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	p of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 5 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5 C	ប វ
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 7 3	Foreign Nation		36	O 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box One		l ve	REFETURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature of			
O 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		5 Drug Related Seizure		al 28 USC 158	C 375 False Cl		40-1
C 120 Marine	Cl 310 Airplane	7 365 Personal Injury -		of Property 21 USC 881	7 423 With	drawal	C 376 Qui Tan	(31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	D 69	0 Other	28 U	ISC 157	3729(a)		nent
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	C 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	3 410 Antitrus	1	
& Enforcement of Judgment 3 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			3 820 Copy 3 830 Pater		7 430 Banks at 7 450 Common		B
3 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	368 Asbestos Personal				at - Abbreviated	O 460 Deporta	tion	
Student Loans	O 340 Marine	Injury Product				Drug Application	3 470 Rackete		
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	PERSONAL PROPER	TY	MAROR OF SALES	SOCIAL	SECURITY	3 480 Consum	Organizati er Credit	ons
of Veteran's Benefits	C 350 Motor Vehicle	7 370 Other Fraud		0 Fair Labor Standards	C 861 HIA	(1395ff)	(7) 490 Cable/S	at TV	2.50
160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	O 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	7.71	Act 0 Labor 2 domana		k Lung (923)	O 850 Secunti		dities/
J 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	Property Damage	13 "	Labor/Management Relations	☐ 864 SSID	C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	Exchan © 890 Other St		tions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	C 385 Property Damage		0 Railway Labor Act	O 865 RSI		O 891 Agricult	tural Acts	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	13.75	I Family and Medical Leave Act			O 893 Environ		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		Other Labor Litigation		ALTAX SUITS	Act		
210 Land Condemnation 220 Forcelosure	O 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 3 463 Alien Detainee	0 79	1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act		s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	3 896 Arbitrat 3 899 Adminis		ocedure
C) 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	X 442 Employment	3 510 Motions to Vacate	.	theone security Act		-Third Party		new or App	
3 240 Torts to Land 3 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	Sentence 3 530 General			26 t	SC 7609	Agency 7 950 Constant	Decision	
CJ 290 All Other Real Property	3 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	3 535 Death Penalty		EMMIGRATION AND	1		State Sta		
2 6 1	Employment	Other;		2 Naturalization Application	1		1,790,000		
	23 446 Amer w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 540 Mandamus & Oth ☐ 550 Civil Rights	cr U 40	S Other Immigration Actions	1				
\	448 Education	3 555 Prison Condition							
1		Conditions of							
	Language Cartes	Confinement					loo ou-zz-		
V. QRIGIN (Place an X"	n One Box Only)							- Silvilizado	
		Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Rein Reo		r District	6 Muludistr Litigation Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi	on -
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you a	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat		iversity)			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca	01 et. seq. & 43 P					0		
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION		Ivania Human Relati EMAND S		CHECK YES only	if domindad	comple	nt:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2		, ,	EMAND 3		URY DEMAND:	/ /	ONo	nt.
VIII. RELATED CAST						THE PARTER ID:	(A) CS	U HO	
IF ANY	(See instructions)	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER	NO,V 1	5 21	018
11/14/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF AT	TARNEY O	OF RECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	0	JUDGE		MAG. JUD	oge.		

Case 5:18-cv-04950-GJP Document 1 Filed 11/15/18 Page 2 of 15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

18

4950

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff:	218 Airy St., L9 Phoenixville, PA 19	460
Address of Defendant:	2620 Egypt Road, Norristown, PA 1	9403
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:		n, PA 19403
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringer numbered case pending or within one year prev 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpucase filed by the same individual?	d to any of the following questions: artier numbered suit pending or within one year Ye grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit ed action in this court? Then of a patent already in suit or any earlier ye viously terminated action of this court? The sus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Ye Is a not related to any case now pending or within or	No V No V No V No V So No V No vertical action in the year previously terminated action in
DATE: 111112010	Attorney-at-Law! Pfo Soft latniff	Attorney l.D. # (if applicable)
CIVIL: (Place a 1 in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ADA & F	2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal 6. Other Personal Injury 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – As 9. All other Diversity Cas (Please specify):	I Injury Please specify): bestos
Michelle Dempsky, Esq.	í	NOV 15 2018
	/ Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff	Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

Cir. 609 (5/2018)



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

A. Send take	TT-TT-	7	PIRT A
		1 A	
	LIL	CA	ΓΙΝΑ



28 4950

WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY

NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a)) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	())
-----	--	-----	---

- (b) Social Security Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.
- (e) Special Management Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)
- (f) Standard Management Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

	>	1
/	*) \
		/

Attorney for
O@LawKM.com

Telephone FAX Number E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02





IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PETER CATINA, 347 Honeylocust Square, Lancaster, PA 17602	Plaintiff,	999	18	4	9	5	0
v.	,	§	Civil Action No.				
WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY, 700 S High Street, West Chester, PA 19382		9 69 69	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED				
2 p. C. (1965)	Defendant.	§					
_							

CIVIL COMPLAINT

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, Peter Catina, (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") by and through his attorney, and files this Complaint alleging as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

Plaintiff, Peter Catina, by and through his counsel, Kraemer Manes & Associates, LLC and Michelle R. Dempsky, Esquire, claim that West Chester University, discriminated against him and failed to engage in an interactive process or offer reasonable accommodation on account of his disabilities, in violation of the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.A. §12101 et. seq. and Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, 43 P.S. §953, et. seq. and he alleges and avers as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This action is initiated pursuant to federal law. The United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Pennsylvania has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States.

- 2. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 3. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2) because Defendant resided in and/or conducts business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.
- 4. Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination and retaliation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). Plaintiff has properly exhausted her administrative proceedings with respect to his EEOC claims by instituting the instant action within ninety (90) days of receiving a right to sue letter from the EEOC. See Notice of Right to Sue, attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein as reference. Plaintiff has also exhausted administrative remedies with respect to his PHRA claims.

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff, Peter Catina, is an adult individual who resides at that above captioned address and
 was at all times an employee of West Chester University working at the above captioned
 address for West Chester University.
- 6. Defendant, West Chester University is an entity or organization duly existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and applicable Federal Laws, with an office at the above captioned address, and at all times relevant herein was Plaintiff's employer.

- Defendant, West Chester University, agreed, accepted, acquiesced, and adopted the actions, omissions, and conduct of its owners, officers, managers, supervisors, employees, and agents, including Martin Patwell, Trish Senengin, Karen Sisafo, and Frank Fry.
- At all times relevant, Defendant West Chester University employed more than twenty-five (25)
 employees in a seventy-five-mile radius for twenty or more workweeks in a calendar year.

Summary of Facts

- Plaintiff Catina was hired by Defendant West Chester University as a permanent full-time
 Professor, and he began work on or around August 25, 2014.
- 10. Plaintiff Catina is still employed by Defendant West Chester University, earning approximately \$7,108.00 in salary annually.
- 11. In 1989, Plaintiff was shot in an altercation.
- 12. As a result of this incident, Plaintiff lost his left eye.
- 13. As a result of this incident, Plaintiff also has reduced vision in his right eye.
- 14. Plaintiff was diagnosed with Apsidal blindness and Central cone dysfunction in his right eye.
- 15. Plaintiff lacks binocular vision as a result of the loss of his left eye.
- Plaintiff suffers from reduced central vision as a result of the conditions affecting his right eye.
- 17. Plaintiff relies heavily upon peripheral vision in his remaining eye.
- 18. The vision dysfunction creates difficulties with reading small print type.
- 19. On Plaintiff's first day of employment with Defendant West Chester University, Plaintiff contacted the director of disability, Mr. Patwell.
- Defendant's employee, Mr. Patwell, told Plaintiff that the office only dealt with disabled students.
- 21. Plaintiff then asked who to contact about disabled faculty members.

- 22. Mr. Patwell referred Plaintiff to Defendant's Human Resources Department.
- 23. Mr. Patwell also stated that there is no office that handled matters specifically for disabled faculty.
- 24. On or around August 25, 2014, Plaintiff contacted Human Resources employee Trish Senengin.
- 25. Plaintiff informed Trish Senengin of his disability on this date.
- 26. Plaintiff requested an ADA form from Trish Senengin.
- 27. Trish Senengin did not provide Plaintiff with this form.
- 28. Trish Senengin informed Plaintiff that he should just send an email detailing his disability.
- 29. On or around August 26, 2015, Plaintiff informed Karen Sisafo of his disability.
- Plaintiff requested that Defendant print Plaintiff's class rosters in large font as an accommodation.
- 31. Plaintiff explained that he made the request because he had difficulty reading the small print.
- 32. Defendant's employee, Karen Sisafo denied that request on or around August 26, 2015.
- 33. On this date, Karen Sisafo also stated that Plaintiff "wasn't disabled" because he had a job.
- 34. Karen Sisafo stated, "I'm not doing that, that's not my job."
- 35. Plaintiff requested the University's American with Disability Act Accommodation Request Form multiple times over four (4) years.
- 36. Plaintiff's disabilities were never listed on the University's American with Disability Act Accommodation Request Form.
- 37. No accommodation was ever offered.
- 38. On or around May of 2016, Defendant's employee, Frank Fry, informed Plaintiff he would be teaching classes in the Spring of 2017.

- 39. Frank Fry was responsible for creating the schedule for this period.
- 40. Frank Fry stated that Plaintiff would be teaching five (5) sections of the Course titled "EXS 102" in the spring of 2017.
- 41. For several months, Plaintiff's name was listed on the university website as instructor for all five (5) sections.
- 42. On or around November 16, 2016, Plaintiff's work was reduced.
- 43. Plaintiff was dropped from teaching two (2) of the aforementioned sections.
- 44. On or around November 16, 2016, Plaintiff contacted Dean Linda Adams and Department Chair Frank Fry.
- 45. In an Email dated November 17, 2016, at 3:29 PM, Frank Fry stated; "due to enrollment issues and the most recent hire of a full-time strength and conditioning coach by the Athletic Department I have reassigned sections of EXS 102. This is the course which he had been teaching for the Department of Kinesiology. He retains two sections, at this time, for the Spring 2017 semester."
- 46. During the Spring 2017 semester, enrollment was increasing at West Chester University.
- 47. The dismissal and notice of rights letter was issued to Plaintiff on August 11, 2016. (See "Exhibit A").
- 48. On Monday, November 6, 2017, Plaintiff was accosted by Packer Larson, a coworker and stretch coach, over the EEOC charge previously filed.
- 49. He blocked the hall, and stated to Plaintiff, "Fuck you," and that Plaintiff was 'making waves' that reflected poorly on him and other staff members.
- 50. Plaintiff complained about this conduct, but the Respondent failed to take any corrective actions against him.

- Additionally, since the return of the previous notice of rights letter, Plaintiff has been constructively discharged.
- 52. The University has failed to schedule Plaintiff to teach any classes in the Spring of 2018 semester.
- 53. Plaintiff is working zero hours, for no pay or benefits.
- 54. This action was a de-facto termination.
- 55. Defendant retaliated against the Plaintiff for filing his EEOC charge.
- 56. Plaintiff filed a second EEOC charge on this basis.
- 57. The Right to Sue letter was received, dated August 18, 2018. (See "Exhibit B").

COUNT I 42 U.S.C. § 1211 e et seq. The Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") Disability Discrimination- Failure to Accommodate

- 58. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth at length herein.
- 59. Defendant West Chester University is an employer under the ADA because it is a partnership, association, corporation, and/or organization engaged in industry affecting commerce that has twenty-five (25) or more employees for each working day in each of twenty (20) or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.
- 60. Plaintiff Catina was hired by Defendant West Chester University as a permanent full-time Professor, and he began work on or around August 25, 2014.
- 61. On Plaintiff's first day of employment with Defendant West Chester University, Plaintiff contacted the director of disability, Mr. Patwell, and informed him of the disability.
- On or around August 26, 2015, Plaintiff contacted Human Resources employee Trish Senengin.
- 63. Plaintiff informed Trish Senengin of his disability on this date.

- 64. Plaintiff requested an ADA form from Trish Senengin.
- 65. On or around January of 2015, Plaintiff informed Karen Sisafo of his disability.
- 66. Plaintiff requested that Defendant print Plaintiff's class rosters in large font as an accommodation.
- 67. Plaintiff explained that he made the request because he had difficulty reading the small print.
- 68. Defendant's employee, Karen Sisafo denied that request on or around August 26, 2015.
- 69. On this date, Karen Sisafo also stated that Plaintiff "wasn't disabled" because he had a job.
- 70. Karen Sisafo stated, "I'm not doing that, that's not my job."
- Plaintiff requested the University's American with Disability Act Accommodation Request
 Form multiple times over four (4) years.
- Plaintiff's disabilities were never listed on the University's American with Disability Act Accommodation Request Form.
- 73. No accommodation was ever offered.
- 74. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff had a disability.
- Defendant refused to accommodate Plaintiff vision-related disability by offering larger-print class rosters.
- 76. Plaintiff suffered damages, including emotional damages, directly and proximately caused by Defendant when Defendant refused to accommodate him.

COUNT II

Retaliation for filing a complaint of Disability Discrimination

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, 42 USCA §12101 et. seq.

Amended by the ADA Amendment Act of 2008

Peter Catina v. Defendant West Chester University

77. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth at length herein.

- 78. Defendant West Chester University is an employer under the ADA because it is a partnership, association, corporation, and/or organization engaged in industry affecting commerce that has twenty-five (25) or more employees for each working day in each of twenty (20) or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.
- 79. Plaintiff has disabilities under the ADA and under the Amended ADA effective January 1, 2009, as Plaintiff has no binocular vision, lacks vision in his left eye, has reduced vision in his right eye, and was diagnosed with Apsidal blindness and Central cone dysfunction in his right eye. This substantially limits him in major life activities including: driving, reading small print, operating specific machinery, and other tasks requiring binocular, keen, or central eyesight.
- 80. Plaintiff's conditions substantially limit him from major life activities.
- 81. Plaintiff is a qualified individual under the ADA, meaning with or without reasonable accommodation he could perform the essential functions of the employment position with Defendant.
- 82. On or around May of 2016, Defendant's employee, Frank Fry, informed Plaintiff he would be teaching classes in the Spring of 2017.
- 83. Frank Fry was responsible for creating the schedule for this period.
- 84. Frank Fry stated that Plaintiff would be teaching five (5) sections of the Course titled "EXS 102" in the spring of 2017.
- 85. For several months, Plaintiff's name was listed on the university website as instructor for all five (5) sections.
- 86. On or around November 16, 2016, Plaintiff's work was reduced.
- 87. Plaintiff was dropped from teaching two (2) of the aforementioned sections.

- On or around November 16, 2016, Plaintiff contacted Dean Linda Adams and Department Chair Frank Fry.
- 89. Plaintiff asked why his schedule had been reduced.
- 90. In an Email dated November 17, 2016, at 3:29 PM, Frank Fry stated; "due to enrollment issues and the most recent hire of a full-time strength and conditioning coach by the Athletic Department I have reassigned sections of EXS 102. This is the course which he had been teaching for the Department of Kinesiology. He retains two sections, at this time, for the Spring 2017 semester."
- 91. During the Spring 2017 semester, enrollment was increasing at West Chester University.
- 92. The dismissal and notice of rights letter was issued to Plaintiff on August 11, 2016.
- 93. On Monday, November 6, 2017, Plaintiff was accosted by Packer Larson, a coworker and stretch coach, over the EEOC charge previously filed.
- 94. He blocked the hall, and stated to Plaintiff, "Fuck you," and that Plaintiff was 'making waves' that reflected poorly on him and other staff members.
- 95. Plaintiff complained about this conduct, but the Respondent failed to take any corrective actions against him.
- 96. Additionally, since the return of the previous notice of rights letter, Plaintiff has been constructively discharged.
- 97. The University has failed to schedule Plaintiff to teach any classes in the Spring of 2018 semester.
- 98. Plaintiff is working zero hours, for no pay or benefits.
- 99. This action was a de-facto termination.
- Defendant retaliated against the Plaintiff for filing his EEOC charge.

101. Plaintiff filed a second EEOC charge on this basis.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands compensatory and punitive damages in addition to counsel fees and costs for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

DATE:

Michelle R. Dempsky, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff

Kraemer, Manes, & Associates, LLC

1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Philadelphia, PA 19103

T: 215-475-3567 F: 215-914-6053





EEOC Form 161 (11/16)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

To;	Peter Catina			
	347 Honey Locust Square			
	Lancaster, PA 17602			

From: Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street Suite 1300

Philadelphia, PA 19107

	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose identity is CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))	
EEOC Charge	No EEOC Representative	Telephone No.
	Legal Unit,	
530-2017-0	1432 Legal Technician	(215) 440-2828
THE EEOC	IS CLOSING ITS FILE ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLOWING	REASON:
	The facts alleged in the charge fail to state a claim under any of the statutes of	enforced by the EEOC.
	Your allegations did not involve a disability as defined by the Americans With	Disabilities Act.
	The Respondent employs less than the required number of employees or is r	not otherwise covered by the statutes.
	Your charge was not timely filed with EEOC; in other words, you waite discrimination to file your charge	ed too long after the date(s) of the alleged
X	The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not be statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be constru	ertify that the respondent is in compliance with
	The EEOC has adopted the findings of the state or local fair employment practice.	ctices agency that investigated this charge.
	Other (briefly state)	

- NOTICE OF SUIT RIGHTS -

(See the additional information attached to this form.)

Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act: This will be the only notice of dismissal and of your right to sue that we will send you. You may file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under federal law based on this charge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

Equal Pay Act (EPA): EPA suits must be filed in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. This means that backpay due for any violations that occurred more than 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may not be collectible.

Enclosures(s)

CC.

Spencer H. Lewis, Jr., District Director (Date Mailed)

Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Andrew C. Lehman, Chief Counsel (for Respondent)

EEOC Form 161-B	Form 161-B (11/16) U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION				
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)					
	Catina oney Locust Square ster, PA 17602	Fro	m: Philadelphia Dis 801 Market Stree Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA	et	
	On behalf of person(s) eggrieved CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.				
EEOC Charge	No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.	
530-2018-0	1508	Legal Unit		(215) 440-2828	
Nozice zo zue	Person Aggrieved:	(See a	lso the additional infor	mation enclosed with this form.)	
Title VII of th Act (GINA): 1 been issued a of your recei	e Civil Rights Act of 1964, the This is your Notice of Right to Sat your request. Your lawsuit u	 Americans with Disabilities Act (AD Sue, issued under Title VII, the ADA or G Inder Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be to sue based on this charge will be lost. 	SINA based on the abo	ve-numbered charge. It has state court <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u>	
X	More than 180 days have pas	ssed since the filing of this charge.			
		sed since the filing of this charge, but I histrative processing within 180 days from			
X	The EEOC is terminating its p	processing of this charge.			
	The EEOC will continue to pro	ocess this charge.			
Age Discrim 90 days after your case:	ination in Employment Act (/ you receive notice that we have	ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA a ve completed action on the charge. In the	t any time from 60 day is regard, the paragra	s after the charge was filed until ph marked below applies to	
X		se. Therefore, your lawsuit under the Al this Notice. Otherwise, your right to su			
	The EEOC is continuing its har you may file suit in federal or	andling of your ADEA case. However, if state court under the ADEA at this time.	60 days have passed	since the filing of the charge,	
in federal or s	tate court within 2 years (3 year	e right to sue under the EPA (filing an EE rs for willful violations) of the alleged EPA <u>vears (3 years)</u> before you file sult m	underpayment. This r	neans that backpay due for	
If you file suit,	based on this charge, please s	end a copy of your court complaint to this	s office.		
		On behalf of the	Commission		
		JeniaRWilliam		8-18-18	
Enclosures(s)	Jamie R. Williams	on,	(Date Malled)	

cc:

Joseph M. Miller University Legal Counsel
PENNSYLVANIA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION **Dixon University Center** 2986 North 2nd Street Harrisburg, PA 17110

Matthew Dempsky KM&A 1628 JFK BLVD, Ste 1650 Philadelphia, PA 19103

District Director